



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,722	06/12/2001	Yasufumi Ichikawa	33677	4905

116 7590 11/22/2004

PEARNE & GORDON LLP  
1801 EAST 9TH STREET  
SUITE 1200  
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108

EXAMINER

PEREZ, ANGELICA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2684

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/879,722

Applicant(s)

ICHIKAWA, YASUFUMI

Examiner

Angelica M. Perez

Art Unit

2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkemes (Malkemes et al.; WO 97/40584) in view of Igarashi (Igarashi et al.; US Patent No.: 5,926,749 A).

Regarding claims 1 and 13, Malkemes teaches of a transmission power control method, voltage controller and apparatus for controlling the power to transmit to the distant party (page 1, lines 11-15 and 22-24; where the control of power in a long distance communication system is effectuated; column 1, lines 7-10 and figure 1), comprising the steps of: controlling a digital-to-analog converter for generating an analog baseband signal (page 4, lines 7-13; where control is exercised by having the stages in a fixed fashion; page 11, lines 9-10; e.g., "...I and Q signals are applied to digital-to-analog converters..."), to be input to a modulator (page 11, lines 10-13; where analog signals are inputted into the modulator in order to convert them into IF signals) for frequency-converting a transmission signal to a signal in an IF band (page 11, lines 10-13; e.g., "...modulated to an intermediate frequency"). Malkemes further teaches of controlling a power amplifier for amplifying the transmission signal modulated by the

Art Unit: 2684

modulator (page 11, lines 17-18; e.g., "the radio frequency signal is then applied to the transmit power amplifier...").

Malkemes does not specifically teach of controlling a plurality of variable power amplifiers for variably amplifying the transmission signal modulated by the modulator.

In related art, concerning an amplifier circuit having common AGC to IF and RF amplifiers for use in a transmitter, Igarashi teaches of controlling a plurality of variable power amplifiers for variably amplifying the transmission signal modulated by the modulator (column 1, lines 24-26; where the apparatus exerts power control utilizing several power amplifiers; figure 1, items 2,3, 4, 6, 8).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Malkemes's power control method and apparatus with Igarashi's variable power amplifiers in order to provide an amplifier circuit suitable for a transmitter, which is capable of realizing a large dynamic range in a simple configuration, as taught by Igarashi.

Regarding claims 2 and 14, Malkemes in view of Igarashi teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 13, respectively. Malkemes teaches where a control ratio of the variable power amplifiers is modified and at least one of series and parallel control in a control range is made in the controlling a plurality of variable power amplifiers (figure 1, items 2, 3, 4, 6, 8; where the examiner has selected an arrangement in series from the choices given by the applicant).

Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkemes in view of (Fujita, Masanori, EP 0,883,250 A2).

Regarding claims 7 and 19, Malkemes teaches of a transmission power control method and apparatus for controlling the power to transmit to a distant party (page 1, lines 11-15 and 22-24; where the control of power in a long distance communication system is effectuated; column 1, lines 7-10 and figure 1). Malkemes further teaches of a power amplifier for amplifying a transmission signal (figure 2, item 160).

a plurality of voltage controllers for controlling the power amplifier via separate bias systems;

Malkemes does not specifically teach of a plurality of voltage controllers for controlling the power amplifier via separate bias systems; and a control unit for controlling the plurality of voltage controllers.

In related art, concerning transmission power control, Fujita teaches of a plurality of voltage controllers for controlling the power amplifier via separate bias systems (figure 4, items 7a and 26 represent voltage controllers; figure 4, items 24 and 25 represent the separate bias systems); and a control unit for controlling the plurality of voltage controllers (figure 4, item 9').

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Malkemes's power control method with Fujita's plurality of voltage controllers in order to set the output power level of the output terminal of the circuit to a desired level, as taught by Fujita.

Art Unit: 2684

3. Claims 3, 5-6, 8-9, 11-12, 15, 17-18, 20-21 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkemes in view of Igarashi as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Fujita.

Regarding claims 3, 9, 15 and 21, Malkemes in view of Igarashi teaches all the limitations of claims 2, 8, 14 and 20, respectively. Malkemes teaches of circuit conditions between a portable telephone and a base station being applied to the transmit output correction circuit (column 1, lines 58-67).

Malkemes in view of Igarashi does not specifically teach of a detection step of detecting a state of at least one of a local station and a distant station; and a modification step of modifying the control ratio according to the detected state.

Fujita further teaches of a detection step of detecting a state of at least one of a local station and a distant station; and a modification step of modifying the control ratio according to the detected state (column 7, lines 28-30 and column 13, lines 19- 47; where the detected states relate to position).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Malkemes's power control method and apparatus with Fujita's detecting a state and ratio control modification in order to provide a transmitter for mobile communication that can provide a high efficiency for a wide output dynamic range, as taught by Fujita.

Regarding claims 5, 11, 17 and 23, Malkemes in view of Igarashi teaches all the limitations of claims 3, 9, 15, and 21, respectively. Fujita further teaches where the control ratio according to the state of at least one of the local station and the distant

station is adaptively modified in the modification step (columns 7, lines 28-30; changes are made as conditions change).

Regarding claims 6, 12, 18 and 24, Malkemes in view of Igarashi teaches all the limitations of claims 1, 7, 13 and 19, respectively. Fujita further teaches where a control sensitivity of each of the plurality of variable power amplifiers differs from each other (figure 1, items 2, 3 and 4; where it is inherent of variable power amplifiers to differ regarding control sensitivity due to physical conditions such as position, interference, etc. See US Patent No.: 6,411,825; column 9, lines 34-39).

Regarding claims 8 and 20, Malkemes in view of Igarashi teaches all the limitations of claims 7 and 19, respectively. Malkemes teaches where a control ratio of the variable power amplifiers is modified and at least one of series and parallel control in a control range is made in the controlling a plurality of variable power amplifiers (figure 1, items 2, 3, 4, 6, 8; where the examiner has selected an arrangement in series from the choices given by the applicant).

4. Claims 4, 10, 16 and 22, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkemes in view of Igarashi and Fujita, and further in view of Davidovici (Davidovici et al.; US Patent No.: 5,963,583).

Regarding claims 4, 10, 16 and 22, Malkemes in view of Igarashi and Fujita teaches all the limitations of claims 3, 9, 15 and 21, respectively.

Malkemes in view of Igarashi and Fujita does not teach where a plurality of the states of at least one of the local station and the destination station are detected in the

Art Unit: 2684

detection step, where the control ratio is modified by using fuzzy control rules and fuzzy inference that are based on the plurality of states in the modification step.

In related art, concerning fuzzy-logic adaptive power control, Davidovici teaches of a plurality of the states of at least one of the local station and the destination station are detected in the detection step, where the control ratio is modified by using fuzzy control rules and fuzzy inference that are based on the plurality of states in the modification step (column s 3 and 4, lines 18-20, 34-39 and 53-60; where the interference is indicated by the S/N ratio and the states are based on position).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Malkemes in view of Igarashi and Fujita variable power control method with Davidovici's Fuzzy-logic controller as an alternative method to manage the constantly changing detection states and to indicate the amount by which to increase or decrease transmitted power, as taught by Davidovici.



***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angelica Perez whose telephone number is 703-305-8724. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:15 a.m. - 3:55 p.m., Monday - Friday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 703-308-7745. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2684

Information regarding Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system can be found at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2600's customer service number is 703-306-0377.

  
Angelica Perez  
(Examiner)

  
EDAN ORGAD  
PATENT EXAMINER/TELECOMM

Art Unit 2684

October 1, 2004